United Nations S/PV.6165

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6165th meeting

Wednesday, 22 July 2009, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Kutesa	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Japan	Mr. Takasu
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Lord Malloch-Brown
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-41769 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, the Central African Republic, Egypt, Germany, Guatemala, India, Italy, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

On behalf of the Council, I wish to extend a warm welcome to His Excellency Lord Malloch-Brown, United Kingdom Minister for Africa, Asia and the United Nations; His Excellency Mr. Ebrahim Ismail Ebrahim, Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa; His Excellency Jean-Francis Bozizé, Minister Delegate at the Presidency of the Central African Republic in charge of National Defence, Veterans Affairs, Victims of War, Disarmament and Restructuring of the Army; and His Excellency Mr. Mohamed Abdullahi Omaar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bozizé (Central African Republic), Mr. Omaar (Somalia), Mr. Ebrahim (South Africa) and the representatives of the other aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend invitations under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Heraldo Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Chile; Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery at the United Nations Development Programme; and Mr. Alastair McKechnie, Director of the Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Group at the World Bank.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2009/304, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda.

Let me begin by thanking Council members for participating in this high-level meeting to focus on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. Members of the Council will recall that the Security Council, in May last year, requested the Secretary-General, the Peacebuilding Commission, international and regional organizations and Member States to consider how to support countries affected by conflict to secure sustainable peace in a faster and more effective way. I would therefore like to thank the Secretary-General for the report he has prepared, which he will be presenting today.

The task before us is to consider and refine strategies through which the United Nations and the international community can effectively support countries emerging from conflict to move towards sustainable peace, reconstruction, economic recovery and development.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is premised on the simple fact that without peace development is not possible, and yet without development peace is not durable. There is need to deliver tangible peace dividends, including the provision of basic services and the improvement of the standard of living of the population.

In accordance with current practice and framework, peacebuilding activities are not envisaged in countries that are still in conflict situations. The Security Council needs to address the critical issue of the early consideration of peacebuilding activities right from the peacemaking and peacekeeping stages.

In any peacebuilding endeavour, national leadership and ownership are of paramount importance. National authorities must take the primary responsibility for re-establishing the key institutions of governance and economic recovery, with the support of the United Nations and international partners. This requires identifying key priorities, developing and agreeing on a national strategy to address them through a widely consultative process, and mobilizing the requisite political, financial and technical support in a coordinated manner.

Our experience in Uganda illustrates the importance of identifying national priorities based on our own unique situation and conditions. We decided that it was important to address post-conflict peacebuilding, starting from 1986, in a sequenced manner, beginning with the most urgent and critical elements. These included efforts to guarantee the security of life and property; embarking on national reconciliation and unity by establishing a broad-based Government; establishing a human rights commission to investigate human rights abuses in the country; and introducing and consolidating the concept of popular democracy.

Other priorities included security sector reform by, inter alia, integrating all former fighting forces into a new national army and granting amnesty to most of them. We launched and executed a nationally agreed minimum recovery programme and then embarked on a process of constitutional reform through countrywide consultations, culminating in the promulgation of a new national Constitution in 1995.

Peacebuilding is a shared responsibility in which the United Nations, subregional and regional organizations and the wider international community have a critical role to play. It does not really matter where conflict situations arise — be it in the Balkans, Asia, Latin America or Africa. The role of regional approaches to solving problems is key because regions have more intimate knowledge of specific situations. Experience in Africa, and in the Great Lakes region in particular, shows that regional efforts can be successful.

The Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, chaired by Uganda and facilitated by South Africa, is a good example in that regard. The knowledge and clear understanding of the political and social dynamics that the regional leaders brought to the peace process in Burundi were critical to resolving the conflict. Burundi is now making steady progress in post-conflict peacebuilding with the support of the East African Community, the African Union, the United Nations and international partners.

The Economic Community of West African States played a positive role in Liberia, while the African Union, through the African Union Mission in Somalia, is currently engaged in efforts to bring peace and stability to Somalia. Regional organizations, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Organization of American States, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have also made substantial contributions to peacebuilding.

The regional organizations in Africa have the necessary human resources, but what they clearly lack are the financial resources. That is where the United Nations and the international community can be of great help. The challenge is how the United Nations can address issues of international peace and security meaningfully and remain relevant. Uganda therefore calls upon the United Nations and international partners to support regional and subregional efforts to strengthen their capacities in peacebuilding.

Post-conflict peacebuilding activities require adequate, flexible and predictable funding. There is urgent need for the United Nations system to ensure greater coherence in peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development activities. We therefore call upon the United Nations to strengthen further its strategic partnerships with the World Bank and other financial institutions. We are encouraged by the initiatives for flexible funding being undertaken by the United Nations through the Peacebuilding Fund and the launching of the in-country multi-donor trust funds. The United Nations should also focus more on implementation of the concepts of a joint United Nations vision and integrated missions in supporting peacebuilding activities.

Finally, we thank all delegations for their contribution to the draft presidential statement as an outcome of our deliberations.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

I welcome the presence of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and invite him to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: First of all, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for taking time to preside over this meeting on a subject of great importance to the United Nations.

In May last year, the Security Council requested a report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. I am pleased to present my report (S/2009/304). It is the product of intensive, wide-ranging consultations. It sets out an approach to peacebuilding that is better resourced, managed and coordinated. The Peacebuilding Commission discussed it last week. I welcome its commitment to championing this important agenda.

Building peace is about much more than ending war. It is about putting in place the institutions and trust that will carry people forward into a peaceful future. We often have a limited window of opportunity in which to do this. The report focuses on that crucial two-year period when conflict has ended but insecurity often persists and peace is fragile. If peace is to be sustainable, the international community must make the most of that moment and provide the right support at the right time.

Decades of international experience have taught us that, while every case is unique, certain types of support are almost always needed. Time and again, war-ravaged people have asked us to help them establish security and safety, restore basic services and core Government functions, support a political transition and jump-start economic recovery.

These are not easy tasks. I have seen the difficulties first hand. I have travelled to many countries emerging from conflict, including the Sudan, Haiti, Liberia and Timor-Leste. I have seen the costs of a slow or inadequate response to urgent post-conflict needs. Yet, I have also seen the profound difference that a well-planned and managed effort can make.

Let me highlight the five interconnected messages of my report.

The first pertains to national ownership. Peace will not take root if it comes from outside. Building peace is primarily a national challenge and responsibility. The United Nations and the international community should play a catalytic and supporting role.

The second message pertains to international leadership. Member States expect the United Nations to lead the international community. I have created a senior-level mechanism that will ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible.

The third message concerns coherence. Effective peacebuilding requires input from all parts of the United Nations system and key partners. Peacebuilding is not separate from mediation, peacekeeping or development aid. It is all of these working together.

The fourth refers to a common strategy. Immediately after conflict, everything feels urgent and there are many pressing needs. We need to align behind a shared approach with realistic priorities against which national and international actors can allocate scarce resources.

The fifth message concerns predictable and credible delivery. Member States need to help ensure that we have sufficient international capacity to respond rapidly and flexibly to the most urgent needs: basic safety, security and services; strengthening the rule of law; supporting political processes; and revitalizing the economy.

To that end, we need a clearer understanding of responsibilities within the United Nations, outlining who will respond in each of these key areas. We also need a deeper and more diverse pool of international civilian expertise. We need prepositioned pooled funding, such as the Peacebuilding Fund, to jump-start action, followed by faster funding from other sources. And we need more and better strategic partnerships with the World Bank, regional organizations, civil society and the private sector.

Member States, for their part, have a crucial part to play. I urge them to speak with one voice across different multilateral forums and to align bilateral support with the common strategy in each country.

Almost a decade ago, in its debate on the theme "No exit without strategy", the Security Council articulated the many challenges associated with the later stages of peacebuilding, when it is time to wind down an international peace operation. In Sierra Leone, as was discussed in this Chamber very recently, we have seen many of the "no exit" lessons being applied. In asking for the report before us, the Council recognized that it also needs to support peacebuilding more effectively from the outset. This requires the engagement and coordination of many different actors, and it requires adequate funding. Some key United Nations actors face serious challenges in securing timely financing.

I encourage the Council to look carefully at these issues as they pertain to existing and future mandates, and as part of initiatives already under way to review peacekeeping mandates. I also encourage members, in the context of next year's review of the Peacebuilding Commission, to consider how they can make more effective use of that body.

My current report is part of a series of initiatives, including my recent report on mediation and the ongoing work on peacekeeping. These efforts share a common goal — to enable the United Nations and its international partners to respond more effectively to countries in crisis in ways that are better tailored to needs on the ground.

I am determined to do my part. I am committed to driving the necessary changes through the United Nations system, but I need the Security Council's support and commitment if we are to achieve real change. I look forward to working with Council members to meet these challenges.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Muñoz.

Mr. Muñoz: I thank you, Sir, for inviting me to take part in this discussion of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). The Peacebuilding Commission met on 13 July to discuss the report. I would like to share with the Council today my summary of those discussions.

The Peacebuilding Commission welcomed the report and endorsed the Secretary-General's approach and recommendations. The preparation of the report usefully brought together the many parts of the United Nations that deal with peacebuilding and highlighted a common understanding of the importance of peacebuilding in the United Nations system. We were pleased that the broad consultation process allowed the Commission to play a significant role in formulating the report.

Members of the Commission focused on some key points. National ownership is the cornerstone of peacebuilding. However, the commitment to national ownership as a key principle of peacebuilding will remain merely an abstract concept unless it is accompanied from the very beginning by capacity-building, starting with a clear understanding of existing capacities on the ground. National capacity-building must start immediately after the end of conflict, taking advantage of that narrow window of opportunity to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and show some peace dividends. It must be part of the entry, not the exit strategy.

Another crucial piece of the early peacebuilding puzzle is an agreed common strategy that is nationally owned and internationally supported, including — depending on the country's concrete reality — basic safety and security, political processes, basic services, core Government functions and early economic revitalization. In that effort, the United Nations staff in-country must work closely with the Peacebuilding Commission so as to ensure proper coordination and avoid duplication.

The Secretary-General's agenda for action proposes stronger, more effective and better supported United Nations leadership on the ground and the creation, as he has reported to us today, of a senior-level mechanism at Headquarters that will ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible. We welcome this suggestion.

Predictable international support is needed for successful peacebuilding. One essential element is greater clarity of lead roles and responsibilities within the United Nations, and enhanced coordination with other key players, such as the World Bank. The Commission welcomes the progress so far and looks forward to further advances.

Civilian experts are an important peacebuilding resource. Country rosters of pre-vetted civilian experts — not least from the global South — could help support the quick delivery of services.

International experts must complement and not replace national expertise. We welcome the Secretary-General's proposal for a review that would broaden and deepen the global pool of expertise and enhance interoperability across rosters. We also support his call regarding the United Nations Volunteers Programme. The diaspora may also be a significant resource in these areas.

We share the Secretary-General's hope that donors will be bold and innovative in establishing flexible, rapid and predictable funding for peacebuilding. We are satisfied with Peacebuilding Fund pledges and funding, and we encourage the Secretary-General to appeal to non-traditional donors, including middle-income countries and the private sector.

Pooled funding mechanisms, such as the country-level multi-donor trust funds, should be established, paying particular attention to the needs of women and historical gender imbalances. Regional organizations have increasingly been at the forefront of peace processes; the challenge ahead includes strengthening partnerships with regional actors, as well as with bilateral donors, civil society and international financial institutions, particularly the World Bank.

Many of the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report are addressed to the United Nations. We therefore welcome the Secretary-General's early initiation of an implementation plan involving all the relevant parts of the Organization. We recognize that the Peacebuilding Support Office will play an important role in this regard.

The Secretary-General's report poses several challenges for the Peacebuilding Commission. Member States recognize that peacekeepers are early peacebuilders. Peacebuilding should therefore come into play early on in the Security Council's consideration of post-conflict situations. The mainstreaming of peacebuilding into peacekeeping operations and the enhancement of the civilian components of peacebuilding operations are a must. The Security Council should consider more proactively the advice of the Commission, not because the Commission is better qualified than the Council for such a task, but only because the Commission will emphasize the linkage between security and development, as well as the longer-term view contributing to sustainable peace.

The Peacebuilding Commission's 2010 review will allow for further reflection on the role of the Commission and how it might better exercise its advisory role. Improving the working methods of the Commission is a goal on our agenda. In particular, we are exploring innovative, lighter and more flexible ways to engage with countries that may seek the Commission's advice.

I have one final reflection. The report stresses the need for early and continued emphasis on coordination and coherence, but a realistic approach will show that this is a most difficult task among multilateral actors, bilateral donors and civil society, and even within the United Nations system. Institutional positioning and turf disputes do not help peacebuilding or national Governments, and efforts to minimize them should continue.

Since many of the Secretary-General's recommendations are addressed to the United Nations system, we believe that he should be invited to report back to the Security Council, in consultation with the Peacebuilding Commission, on their implementation.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate the Commission's strong support for the Secretary-General's recommendations. Attention must now turn to their rapid implementation. The people in post-conflict countries will benefit if we move forward to action.

The President: I thank Mr. Muñoz for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Jordan Ryan.

Mr. Ryan: I thank you, Sir, for inviting the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to address the Council on this important report (S/2009/304). We in UNDP warmly welcome the report, as well as this opportunity to add the perspective of UNDP to the statement of the Secretary-General.

Under the leadership of UNDP Administrator Miss Helen Clark, we are committed to working with partners both within and outside the United Nations system to ensure the smooth and effective implementation of the recommendations contained in the report, under the guidance of the Secretary-General. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office will play an important

role in facilitating the follow-up process, and UNDP pledges its close cooperation with both.

UNDP contributes to peacebuilding through our presence in all conflict-affected countries, including countries going through conflict, countries that have recently emerged from conflict and countries that are moving into a longer-term recovery.

Many post-conflict countries are struggling to make progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and effective and quick peacebuilding action is essential if countries are to succeed in their MDG effort. Development of national capacities must remain a core peacebuilding objective.

In moving the peacebuilding agenda forward, we must strive to effectively link short-term peacebuilding activities with longer-term recovery and development. We also need to remember that peacebuilding does not start from scratch when a conflict is over. It should always build on existing national capacities and draw on the expertise of the in-country United Nations presence, including the humanitarian and development actors.

At the country level, United Nations funds and programmes work together for peacebuilding under the leadership of a resident coordinator. When the Security Council provides a mandate, the United Nations country team works with other system partners as part of an integrated mission.

The Secretary-General's report suggests new steps to take the integration process forward and to strengthen the coordination and accountability of the United Nations country presence. The report's emphasis is rightly focused on the need for stronger and more coherent United Nations leadership teams, with the right support staff, to plan and coordinate the joint effort.

Women and youth require special attention. Peacebuilding efforts should make sure that they benefit from peace dividends and that they are fully engaged in planning and decision-making processes. In this respect, UNDP is currently deploying Senior gender advisers in 10 post-conflict countries. They will support the Organization's system-wide efforts to implement Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008) in an effort to stop sexual violence against women.

The World Bank is an important partner for the United Nations in post-conflict situations. We have gained significant experience working together on the ground in a number of post-conflict countries, but we can do even better based on recognition of each other's strengths and a continued commitment to putting global agreements for cooperation into practice at the country level.

An effective United Nations response will require active support from Member States, including the necessary funding. With this support, we in the United Nations will do our utmost, under the leadership of the Secretary-General, to match expectations of quick and effective implementation of peacebuilding activities. UNDP looks forward to contributing actively to this effort as part of the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

The President: I thank Mr. Ryan for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Alastair McKechnie.

Mr. McKechnie: The President of the World Bank, Mr. Robert Zoellick, is unfortunately unable to be here today, and I wish to transmit his greetings and convey his appreciation for this important report and for inviting the World Bank to address the Council.

The report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) recognizes that the efforts of the international community immediately post-conflict have been less than fully effective.

The World Bank was deeply involved in the preparation of the report. We welcome its findings. We applaud the critical leadership role that the United Nations can provide in post-conflict situations. We support the report's efforts to resolve the inherent tensions that arise between the need for speed in responding to fragile situations and the need for compliance with a coherent strategy that is nationally owned.

Such tensions often result from different perceptions of priorities by the international community and partner countries, which paradoxically may want a greater emphasis on building their institutions and sustainable development that reduces poverty. We should not forget also the demands for quality, the effectiveness of our support, and the need for financial accountability to maintain long-term, predictable financial support.

The report rightly recognizes that we should seek the views of the partner countries on what they consider to be their priorities. Often we will find that the highest priorities are personal security, justice and the ending of impunity, not the easier public services that the international community can readily provide. There is also a need for clear and agreed priorities around which recovery efforts can coalesce.

But the inevitable challenge remains: how can priorities be set when everything seems to be a priority? We support the recommendations of the report for more effective planning based on a post-conflict needs assessment. However, we would suggest the following five points when setting priorities.

First, priorities should be driven by country demand, not by what we think is best or what we are able to deliver. Secondly, they should provide some short-term results, preferably consistent with mid-term priorities and, at the same time, should lay the basis for sustainable development, growth and employment. Thirdly, they should aim to strengthen the legitimate authority of the State by enabling it to set and enforce rules and laws, manage its budget, deliver services effectively and embody national traditions and values. Fourthly, priorities should not aim to replace the State but to be its facilitator and enabler. And fifthly, they should consider an exit strategy, namely, how to transfer responsibility to the legitimate State as early as possible.

The Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action articulate a framework for delivering aid. Experience has shown us that aid is most effective and most supportive of State-building when it is provided under national leadership and through country systems.

In the context of peacebuilding, how do we increase our effectiveness? Effectiveness is often as much about how foreign assistance is provided as it is about the volume of that aid. Experience suggests some guidelines for effectiveness. First is to tailor our assistance to the country context. Second is to avoid taking a linear approach to our response, as support for State-building needs to take place during the peacekeeping phase, not only after it. Third is to develop institutions and policies and the preparation of investment in parallel with peacebuilding. Fourth is to sequence reforms for economic stability with political cycles, to avoid triggering governance crises that will make economic reform impossible. And fifth is to reduce the administrative burden that donors impose on weak States by aggregating projects into national programmes and pooling finance through trust funds.

Finally, we need to recognize and manage risks, not only the risks that money will be misappropriated but also the risk that peace fails because we are too bureaucratic and too slow. There are ways to manage risks in high-corruption environments, including by contracting fiduciary agents and giving voice to citizens. But we need to recognize that things will go wrong and deal with problems quickly and decisively.

The report refers to the agreements signed last year between the Secretary-General and the President of the World Bank to strengthen our partnerships in post-crisis situations. That is supported by a fiduciary principles accord that has now been signed with 11 United Nations agencies to facilitate the timely transfer of financial resources under trust funds administered either by the World Bank or the United Nations Development Group, when that is appropriate in the country context.

We see synergies and complementarities in the operation of the World Bank's State- and Peacebuilding Fund and the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund. Both instruments provide predictable, adaptive and responsive financing mechanisms specifically tailored to meet the needs of countries emerging from conflict. But the United Nations and the Bank are only elements of a wider set of agencies that work to assist countries recovering from conflict. Last year, the European Commission, the United Nations Development Group and the Bank issued a joint declaration on how they will provide assistance and support in post-crisis situations and plan recovery efforts.

Greater coherence requires strengthening other partnerships as well, particularly with regional and bilateral political, security and development organizations. The demand for speed and effectiveness dictates that international cooperation is centred and anchored in the field at the country level. Context matters, and time and directives from the centre may fail to capture the realities of a dynamic post-conflict environment. We therefore endorse the proposal that the integration steering group explore the development of mutual accountability measures at the country level. We hope that those efforts will encourage greater acknowledgement by other international actors that aid

effectiveness is born of coherency, coordination and joint mechanisms for funding and implementation.

While Government leadership is a critical ingredient in guiding post-conflict recovery and reconstruction efforts, so too is the ability of the international community to coordinate its response. In most post-conflict situations, it is the office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General that offers the key to that coordination. The wider the leadership role provided by the Special Representative for the international effort, the greater the level of delegation by agencies to senior management in the field and the better aligned agency support is to the demand of those officials. The more funding for United Nations agencies that is programmed through the office of the Special Representative, the more likely we are to achieve the levels of coherence, coordination and effectiveness we seek.

The World Bank is ready to consider more formal roles within the specialized missions, including staff secondments or better integration of conventional aid coordination mechanisms. The World Bank also stands ready to participate in joint consultations and planning on post-crisis and crisis-affected countries, so as to ensure early and effective preparations of our joint response. Let me add that we are currently working on an exchange of staff between the United Nations and World Bank headquarters to strengthen our joint response to situations of fragility and conflict.

The international community should also recognize comparative advantages arising from different mandates and capacities. Division of labour will depend upon what the country requires and the capacity of organizations to respond. The agreements between the United Nations and the World Bank set out the process for quickly agreeing our responsibilities.

The report also highlights one of the most difficult areas of development and proposes new ways of working, such as the establishment of deployable civilian capacity, which will be challenging to implement. The report card on the quality of coordination by the international community is mixed. We should not confuse capacity building with technical assistance. In his report, the Secretary-General challenges us to do better.

Going forward, we need to recognize how little we know about the effectiveness of the instruments we have to avoid a relapse into violent conflict. We need to learn as we go forward. We encourage that the impact of the innovations set out in this report be monitored and evaluated, and that we commit to continue to seek out new ways to improve our speed and effectiveness.

The current budgetary constraints faced by donor countries as a consequence of the global financial crisis must be seen as an opportunity to rationalize the international community's interventions and make them more effective. We now need to move forward expeditiously to support country efforts to consolidate peace and to lay the foundation for development that reduces poverty. We need to continue our work together to make that happen.

The President: I thank Mr. McKechnie for his briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes, in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate their texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Lord Malloch-Brown (United Kingdom): I would like to thank the Secretary-General, Ambassador Muñoz, Alistair McKechnie and Jordan Ryan for their briefings this morning. I am delighted to be able to take part in this debate myself. This is an issue in which I have been closely involved, both when working at the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank and now as a Minister in the British Government. This is an issue in which I hope the United Kingdom has been able to lead. Today's debate follows the initiative of my Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary last year to press for real improvement in the response of the United Nations to post-conflict situations.

I am also delighted that we have as Council President today someone who is both a personal friend and a representative of a country that has done so much hard work and has so much experience to share on this issue. I think having you in the chair, Mr. President, is an eloquent reminder that we have got to intensify our efforts to prevent and reduce conflict worldwide,

because countries affected by conflict face a tragic human cost. They account for a third of the people living in extreme poverty, half the children not in primary school and half the children who die before their fifth birthday.

As we know to our cost, ungoverned spaces, such as those in Afghanistan or Somalia, offer safe havens for international crime or terrorism. Today United Kingdom and Ugandan soldiers, as well as those of other Member States, are laying down their lives to build peace in these countries. United Nations peacekeepers play an indispensable role, providing space for peace agreements to take hold and protecting the most vulnerable. We will chair a Security Council debate next month, as part of our joint initiative with France, to look at how we can enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping.

But peacekeeping alone is not enough. A third of countries fall back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement being reached, so it is critical that we improve the effectiveness of peacebuilding. We know what needs to happen in countries emerging from conflict — the economy needs to be revitalized, creating jobs that give an alternative to violence and crime. Basic services need to be kick-started, and police, courts and prisons need to be re-established so that everyone has access to accountable and affordable justice.

In other words, we need to help reconstitute the basic functions of a viable State, and that needs to happen quickly. There is a critical window of perhaps 24 months after a peace agreement is signed. Experience shows that if we do not get it right during that period, the risk of a return to conflict increases dramatically.

We too strongly welcome the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304). Building on that report, I would identify five priorities for action in the coming months. We have heard something of these already.

First, we must get clarity as to the roles and responsibilities of the United Nations and the World Bank so that there is accountability for what happens on the ground. Second, we must launch a review of civilian capacities, to give us a better idea of where the gaps are and how these experts can be deployed more rapidly to build national capacities. Thirdly, effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership must be deployed from the outset, to corral international actors and drive delivery of assistance. Fourthly, access to rapid and flexible financing must be improved, including through the Peacebuilding Fund and multi-donor trust funds. Fifthly, we must build on the achievements so far of the Peacebuilding Commission. It should focus on addressing barriers to peacebuilding, ensuring that international efforts are better harmonized, and mobilizing additional resources.

The Secretary-General's report gives us a framework for a better-led, more coherent, faster and more predictable international response to immediate post-conflict situations, but the real test will be delivery on the ground. A recent United Kingdom White Paper — "Building our Common Future" — underlines our commitment to working with the United Nations, the World Bank and other Member States to help make this happen. The Secretary-General has a critical role to play. We applaud his leadership. I urge Member States to rally behind his agenda for action. We cannot afford to lose this opportunity. The human costs are simply too great.

Mr. Lacroix (France) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, my delegation wishes to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this meeting on an important subject, one close to us all. We welcome your presence here with us, and we also welcome the presence of the Secretary-General.

Permit me to make a few remarks. I wish first to thank the Secretariat, and the Secretary-General for his report (S/2009/304), which certainly provides the most in-depth thinking to date on the matter of post-conflict peacebuilding. That is a major area of work for the United Nations, with great potential, comparable to that of the tool that we have used so far, namely, peacekeeping.

However, we are only at the very beginning of this process. The report marks an essential step in thinking about improving the United Nations capacity to respond to the challenges of peacebuilding. Today, we need to pursue our thoughts and our concrete actions.

I would like to focus on two challenges. The first is that we are not yet strategic enough. A greater analytical effort is needed. Before we can begin to check the cycle of violence and conflict, we must be able to analyze the causes and factors. That approach is also true for conflict prevention.

Then we need to identify priorities. After emerging from a conflict, that is not simply a rule for action; it is the only way to move forward. On that point we welcome the recommendations in the report to make the assessments carried out by the Secretariat teams more political and to follow a logical sequence in order to be available more quickly. I wish to stress that it is only by working on a limited number of priorities that we will be effective; I think that is a comment everyone shares.

Finally, we need to be consistently opportunistic, in the good sense of the word; we must be rapid, agile and flexible. It is at the deployment of an operation, or even before, that we must begin to sketch out a peacebuilding strategy. The recommendations set out in the report to allow the deployment of civilian personnel and competent specialized teams along with the special representatives on the ground make good sense, and we hope they can be carried out.

The second challenge, as we see it, is that we are not yet fully mobilized. There is progress to be made in this area.

The United Nations has a central role to play in peacebuilding, because it alone has all of the instruments — political, military, humanitarian and development — on which we can base an effective strategy. But the United Nations is still quite fragmented in its interventions. Here also, the Secretary-General's recommendations are aimed at improving consistency in our response to these challenges, and we welcome this. We have some clear examples already, in Sierra Leone or the Central African Republic.

Setting up financial mechanisms adapted to the challenges of peacebuilding is even more necessary now, because the actions required surpass the capacity of a small number of actors. The Peacebuilding Fund by itself cannot fully play its role if mobilization by the international community is not assured. There is a role that the Peacebuilding Commission has already begun to play for the four countries on its agenda. It has broadened its donor base and is reaching out to non-traditional donors, even the private sector.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore that a rapid intervention by the international community during the immediate post-conflict phase draws on the same care for effectiveness that has led France, with the United Kingdom, to propose discussion in the Security Council on follow-up to and improvement of peacekeeping. The same principles apply: the need for better follow-up, and use of indicators and milestones.

We hope that peacebuilding will now be clearly understood as a dimension of peacekeeping, and not simply as the next stage. The requirement for effectiveness is the condition for a lasting commitment by the international community to help countries emerging from crisis.

To conclude, I will say that France fully supports the draft presidential statement submitted to us.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for presiding over today's important debate. I wish to thank the Secretary-General for personally presenting the very important report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). We are also grateful to the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their very useful perspectives. I am particularly pleased that in today's debate the United Nations system as a whole is according high priority to the issue of post-conflict stabilization.

Over the course of its history, the United Nations has been faced with a multitude of challenges. Despite its best efforts, however, conflicts have not been brought to an end. Worst of all, peace agreements are often broken within a few years' time, leaving the most vulnerable groups of people trapped in a vicious circle of misery and conflict.

The United Nations has mobilized to reverse that situation, using several instruments. First, by deploying peacekeeping operations and extending humanitarian and development assistance, the United Nations has contributed to preventing the recurrence of misery and conflict in many parts of the world. Lately, the Peacebuilding Commission has promoted integrated support, but usually well after a peace agreement has been signed and peacekeepers have left the country.

So there is clearly a gap that is not being fully met by those existing instruments. In a society just emerging from conflict, there is a high expectation of safer and better livelihoods, but we have learned the hard lesson that a high price must be paid later because of the failure to take opportunities at the optimal time.

It was against that backdrop that the very important report of the Secretary-General before us

was requested by the Security Council. Today, I should like to highlight a few points of a general nature that are particularly relevant to the work of the Council.

My first point concerns the Council's relationship with peacekeeping operations. Today, when we discuss the immediate aftermath of a conflict as being up to 24 months after the signing of a peace agreement, it is important to clearly understand the relationship between peacekeeping operations and what we are talking about — peacebuilding. When a peace agreement results from United Nations peacemaking efforts, the security situation is still very fragile, so the agreement is frequently followed by the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation mandated by the Security Council. In this case, we must explore more precisely to what extent the mandate of a Council-mandated peacekeeping operation could be expanded to include peacebuilding activities such as, inter alia, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, democratic governance, the rule of law and support for capacity-building.

Recently — particularly over the past eight or nine years, I believe — the Council has authorized some of those activities in recent mandates of peacekeeping operations. But clearly, there is a limit to the degree to which a peacekeeping operation itself can carry out all of those peacebuilding activities, given the range of expertise, implementing agencies, backstopping authority at Headquarters and financing methods needed.

On the other hand, if some of these peacebuilding activities are carried out by other entities — whether they be United Nations entities or others — in parallel with the peacekeeping operation, we need to consider how the mission can better harmonize and coordinate with those other activities. Therefore, the Council's comprehensive review of the effective implementation of peacekeeping operations — including through the ongoing work of the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations — is important. We commend the Secretariat's initiatives, such as the New Horizon project, which is very useful. They are all integral parts of the United Nations effort aimed at ensuring stronger and more coherent responses to international threats.

I should also like to stress that it is important for the Council to acknowledge that peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding should be pursued not in sequence, but simultaneously.

My second point concerns strategy and leadership. One of the characteristics of post-conflict peacebuilding — unlike peacekeeping operations — is the need for active participation by a diverse range of experts and many actors and for programmes involving various methods of work and financing. Therefore, it is indispensable that various United Nations organs and other stakeholders work in a coordinated and coherent fashion from the very outset.

In promoting partnership, national leaders and diverse partners must share a common vision of what they are working together to achieve in order to avoid a relapse into conflict. National ownership is of the very first order, as everyone has stressed so far. However, we must recognize that, in the immediate aftermath of conflict, national capacity is very limited. Therefore, with full respect for the country's ownership, the United Nations is expected to take a leading role and to adopt an action-oriented approach, initially with a streamlined priority plan and subsequently with an integrated strategy. We must be flexible in its sequencing and simplify planning and prioritize projects for speedy action. It is essential to produce a tangible, visible outcome in order to gain the confidence of the local population, even before an elaborate integrated strategy is in place.

To pursue a common vision and coherence among various players, we need strong leadership. The most senior United Nations representative in the field is usually tasked with the challenges of bringing the partners to the table and mobilizing resources. It is equally important to ensure that field representatives receive coordinated guidance and support from Headquarters. Therefore, we welcome the Secretary-General's initiative to strengthen his senior-level coordinating mechanism at Headquarters. The responsibilities of the lead department and the role of other departments, programmes and funds at Headquarters should be clearly defined so as to maximize impacts and resources.

My third point concerns implementing capacity — people and money. In order to implement peacebuilding efforts according to a vision or a priority plan, we need to strengthen implementation capacity. Here, civilians with experience in a wide range of specialized areas are essential. Recommendations such

as a standing capacity for a quick-reaction team — as mentioned in the Secretary-General's report — creating a roster and training are important and deserve detailed examination and implementation on a priority basis. The United Nations should also tap into the knowledge and expertise of particular Member States, especially those in the developing world. For its part, Japan initiated a training programme for Asian peacebuilding experts at the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre three years ago. We are ready to support United Nations efforts in this area.

Mobilizing additional resources is vitally important. The recommendations that a new type of multi-donor trust fund — either country-specific or general-purpose — be created and that the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund be expanded need careful review in terms of their feasibility. In the current situation, in which the peacekeeping budget is consuming so many resources, and in the light of the substantial resource requirements in the immediate aftermath of conflict — here, we are talking about a different magnitude of resources — we all need to think creatively and to make the best possible use of existing channels, including international financial institutions such as the World Bank and regional development banks. The creation of new financial mechanisms needs to be attractive from the donors' point of view. We also need to identify non-traditional partners and expand the donor base.

Finally, the Peacebuilding Commission has definitely played an extremely important role in mobilizing support for four specific countries designated by the Security Council. They are making serious efforts — in most cases, after the peacekeeping operation in question has been completed. The strength and comparative advantage of the Peacebuilding Commission is its convening and coordinating power, which is based on an elaborate integrated strategy. I believe that what is now necessary is to consolidate the Commission's achievements, rather than to expand its responsibilities beyond its capacity.

Of course, Japan is open to the idea of examining how the Peacebuilding Commission can make a difference in the early phase of post-conflict recovery. But we need to realize that peacebuilding activities in the immediate aftermath of conflict require different methods of work and support mechanisms — not only on the ground, but also at Headquarters — from those that have been employed over the past several years. We should also recognize that, in the situation under consideration, peacekeeping operations are most often being deployed in parallel. Therefore, I believe that, as the parent body, the Security Council has the responsibility to play its useful role of tasking the Peacebuilding Commission with providing advice and assistance on specific aspects of peacebuilding challenges.

In conclusion, we very much hope to take advantage of this opportunity and that the United Nations will strengthen its response to post-conflict early recovery.

Ms. DiCarlo (United States of America): Mr. President, the United States welcomes your presence today and expresses its gratitude for this opportunity to discuss peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. We would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his comments and Ambassador Muñoz, Mr. Ryan and Mr. McKechnie for their briefings. In addition, we express our appreciation to United Nations staff worldwide who are working to help countries make the difficult transition from conflict to peace.

Too many populations that have endured the hardships of conflict experience persistent violence and instability. They often lack the conditions necessary to restore governance, restart economies and rebuild communities. Shoring up peace processes at risk can often take attention from the wider efforts needed to put countries on a steady path to long-term stability and development.

The overarching objective of our peacebuilding efforts must be to assist local authorities to develop the capacity to manage their own transitions to recovery. This means helping them restart basic functions of governance, establish the conditions for economic recover and create a secure environment in which affected populations can begin to rebuild shattered lives.

While other actors besides the United Nations have a role in peacebuilding, an effective United Nations can provide an unparalleled platform for unity of effort and overall success. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) provides a clear road map for the United Nations system to ensure that its assistance is well conceived, well led and sufficiently resourced. We welcome the Secretary-General's personal commitment

to ensuring an improved United Nations response in post-conflict situations.

The United States strongly supports the report's recommendations on strategy, leadership and accountability, which are essential to delivering critical support to national authorities, and we agree that effective civilian capacity and response should be at the core of international efforts to support sustainable peace. We welcome the report's emphasis on the need for rapid deployment of high-quality leadership and multidisciplinary teams to backstop it, and we particularly welcome the emphasis on Southern capacity, an undertapped and invaluable resource.

Let me also underscore the important contribution of women to post-conflict recovery and the need to involve women more actively in the essential tasks of rebuilding communities and lives.

The Secretary-General's report also makes a number of observations regarding financing post-conflict activities. The United States agrees that early and flexible assistance is crucial. We also support the call to revitalize efforts to strengthen cooperation in peacebuilding between the United Nations and international financial institutions. The division of labour within the United Nations system and between the United Nations and other key partners continues to be a high priority for us, and we stress the need to make progress in this area.

Efforts to build national capacity must start early. Capacity-building cannot be delayed until the day an international security presence departs. Early and sustained attention to the requirements of peacebuilding must occur alongside peacekeeping in order to ensure a successful transition to a durable peace. To that end, we welcome early dialogue with the Peacebuilding Commission.

The United States will work to ensure that the Council takes earlier account of peacebuilding in decision-making on peace operations and in reviewing mandates. We have already expressed our intention to consider critical peacebuilding requirements when we review peacekeeping missions in Liberia and Haiti this coming autumn.

Council members will soon have had the opportunity to consider questions related to mediation, peacebuilding and peacekeeping, including the New Horizon initiative of the United Nations. The United States believes that now is the time to move forward on these issues in a more integrated way.

Finally, we also are fully supportive of the draft presidential statement submitted by the delegation of Uganda.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes your presence, Mr. President, at this important meeting of the Security Council. We thank the Secretary-General for introducing his very important report (S/2009/304), which brings together analysis and experience gathered over the past two decades in countries emerging from conflict. We also welcome Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Mr. Jordan Ryan and Mr. Alastair McKechnie.

My delegation agrees with the Secretary-General that the period immediately following the cessation of hostilities is a vital time for laying the foundations of true peacebuilding. In that initial phase, cooperation and coordination among lead actors is essential in order to promote coherent, comprehensive strategies and plans of action. Obviously, priorities must be established during that crucial post-conflict phase. Then, once there has been progress on security and on meeting the basic needs of the population, it is essential to take steps to restore legitimate government institutions seen as representative of all national groups, and to introduce political, legal, economic and administrative reforms making possible a properly functioning and harmonious relationship between the State and society.

Mexico has always stressed that national ownership is key to peacebuilding efforts. For that reason, along with the need for collective support by international actors, measures must be fundamentally aimed at strengthening and promoting national leadership and ownership, without ignoring an appropriate balance between promoting local responsibility and promoting international support, as the Secretary-General points out.

In that regard, the development of political efforts towards reconciliation is of particular importance. Trust and national reconciliation are key elements in defining a framework for action which incorporates priorities set by the local actors themselves, has the support of international teams and includes a comprehensive view of the role of the United Nations in the political, humanitarian, security and development spheres.

The agenda outlined by the Secretary-General highlights the importance of improving coherence and coordination, clearly defining functions and responsibilities, promoting national capacity, ensuring predictable resources, preparing studies on a country's needs and situation, and ensuring accountability. We believe that those areas are crucial for improving the response of the United Nations in its reconstruction activities. Mexico supports measures aimed at attaining those objectives and supports the Secretary-General's initiative on seeking appropriately qualified personnel to carry out the complex tasks needed for the Organization's activities both at Headquarters and on the ground, making use in particular of permanent staff members and specialized peacebuilding professionals.

The initiatives regarding the recruitment of trained personnel from the Southern Hemisphere and regarding the participation of women — whose involvement in peacebuilding tasks, we believe, is essential — merit particular mention. Mexico supports the report's well-considered proposal to create a senior-level mechanism ensuring that both managers and regional support teams will be ready to support post-conflict activities. We propose that such a team could be headed by an eminent individual from the South; we look forward to hearing more specific information about the membership and functions of this mechanism.

My delegation sees the Partnership Framework Agreement signed with the World Bank as a very positive step forward, this will make possible improved strategic coordination and enhanced impact of collective endeavours.

With respect to donors, we agree with the Secretary-General that measures should be taken to find solutions that will establish flexible, rapid, predictable and more risk-tolerant funding modalities. In that regard, it would also be appropriate to encourage donors to disburse resources in accordance with the timetables that have been set, so that funding will arrive on time for strategies that are already being implemented.

Mexico believes that the work of the Peacebuilding Commission is crucial for a coherent and comprehensive approach to promoting reconstruction in the immediate aftermath of conflict. My country recognizes the Commission's achievements to date and encourages it to continue to enhance and broaden its advisory role in countries on its agenda and to ensure timely follow-up with respect to progress in implementing Strategic Frameworks for Peacebuilding. My country believes that the Commission must play a central role, in coordination with other United Nations actors, in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary-General. In our view, it is not only the Security Council that must be more proactive in seeking the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission; the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council must do the same, in terms of coherence, greater mobilization of resources and coordination of efforts with entities outside the system, along with working with local actors to devise and implement peacebuilding strategies.

Mexico has participated in Lebanon, Timor-Leste, Haiti, Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina, assisting those Governments in their electoral institution-building efforts. We have also put forward proposals for electoral cooperation within the framework of the peacebuilding strategies for Guinea-Bissau and Burundi. Mexico will continue to make a contribution to peace efforts in countries in the immediate post-conflict phase by providing technical assistance and training of decision makers in the electoral sphere when such assistance is requested.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its support for the draft presidential statement put forward by the Ugandan delegation.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): Mr. President, allow me to begin by welcoming you here with us and thanking you for chairing this meeting. We also thank your delegation for organizing this debate, which has focused our attention on a topic that not only deserves the sustained attention of the Security Council but also needs to be approached in a coherent and coordinated manner. Let me also thank the Secretary-General for being here with us and for his remarks in which he presented us with concrete steps for moving forward on actions charted by the presidential statement that the Council adopted last year (S/PRST/2008/16) under the United Kingdom presidency. We would also like, of course, to thank Ambassador Muñoz and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank for their contributions today.

While Croatia aligns itself with the statement to be made on behalf of the European Union, allow me to

add some further remarks in our national capacity. Post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization has been recognized as critical in laying the foundations for lasting and sustainable peace. The early success of peacebuilding efforts is undoubtedly a matter of collective interest, as failed peacebuilding risks bringing about a definite backlash and the return to violence and new wars. Given that the window for action in a post-conflict period may not be longer than a few — approximately two — years, it is indispensable that those involved in peacebuilding be ready to start immediately and offer rapid support to national authorities alongside a peacekeeping deployment. Clear goals, effective leadership and coordination, adequate resources and an appropriate mandate are required in order to be able to rapidly provide basic security and early peace dividends as well as to build confidence in a political process and expand core national capacity in a highly volatile environment.

We welcome the Secretary-General's report before us (S/2009/304) as making an important contribution to coherence and the integration of efforts on a practical level by identifying challenges and spelling out a number of concrete steps to develop and improve United Nations capabilities in support of national efforts to end war and secure a sustainable peace. We particularly welcome the five points stressed by the Secretary-General and offer our full support in that respect.

Croatia is pleased to see that the approach taken by the Secretary-General has prominently endorsed the concept of national ownership of the peacebuilding effort. Our own experience during the war imposed on Croatia in the 1990s, when a number of United Nations missions and agencies operated on the ground, led us to conclude that external actors may have come with the best of intentions, but in some cases were not able to understand the real needs of the population or cooperate effectively with each other or with the local institutions involved. External actors alone may sometimes be ill-equipped to rebuild the institutions of a war-torn State. Peacebuilding efforts anchored at the country level are inextricably linked to their legitimacy and sustainability. National actors need to be part of an early peace dividend.

It is our view that the key demand regarding peace operations in general is sustainability. As the Secretary-General mentions in his report, peace operations are not quick fixes. There can be early windows of opportunity during which peace can be achievable, but there is also a series of small practical movements and undertakings — the so-called everyday life of a peace operation — which have to be given our full attention.

We have to build upon early successes and achievements in the field; we have no right to be discouraged by the obstacles and setbacks that we will inevitably face. Likewise, we believe that capacity-building is crucial and might easily be the most fundamental issue in peacekeeping. We should also factor in the unavoidable issue of spoilers, against whom we have to fight with patience and resilience.

For Croatia, the centrepiece of international peacebuilding efforts continues to be found in the United Nations architecture, notably in the Peacebuilding Commission, which, together with the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund, represents the key mechanism to ensure greater coherence in international efforts, including on one of the key issues: the sustainable financing of peacebuilding. As the principal organ for maintaining international peace and security, the Security Council is well-placed to provide suggestions for integrated peacebuilding and to offer guidance in situations on its agenda.

While the United Nations is increasingly expected to play a leadership role in the field, it is often just one among many actors on the ground. The report rightly points out the need to build strategic partnerships, notably with the World Bank. Such partnerships need to be based on recognizing the clear comparative advantages provided by different actors on the international, regional and subregional level, while integrating the peacemaking, peacekeeping and development spheres. This in turn underscores the need for greater clarity in delineating the role and responsibilities of different actors, both within and outside the United Nations, and the need to have well-defined mandates that are complementary, mutually reinforcing and achievable.

Croatia is grateful to the Secretary-General for presenting a concrete agenda for action aimed at strengthening United Nations responsiveness in the immediate aftermath of conflict, based on effective leadership, enhanced coordination and accountability and predictable civilian deployment and financing. We

support the agenda and, in particular, its recommendations aimed at strengthening effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership on the ground as well as those promoting integrated planning and common assessments and the strategic consolidation of competing individual agendas.

At all times, local actors and the development of their capacities need to remain at the heart of the process. In order to meet peacebuilding priorities, the United Nations has to provide for the deployment of civilian experts, and we welcome the steps proposed by the Secretary-General aimed at expanding and improving existing capacities. We also recognize that success largely depends on reliable funding mechanisms and support.

Croatia believes that the text of the draft presidential statement we are to adopt today reflects the main messages of this debate, and it has our support. We see efforts aimed at enhancing responsiveness in post-conflict environments by adopting a more coherent, effective and focused approach as part and parcel of the wider effort to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to play its role to the fullest extent in conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, in an integrated and coherent manner.

Mr. Urbina (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to begin by thanking the Secretary-General for introducing his report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) and for his presence here. We would also like to thank Lord Malloch-Brown, Ambassador Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Mr. Ryan and Mr. McKechnie for their participation in our debate and for their contributions.

Costa Rica believes that peacebuilding is not just an ingredient that we should think of when we are preparing to end a peacekeeping operation. It is actually an objective that we should bear in mind whenever we are preparing for the United Nations to intervene, as has been repeatedly recalled here today. We advocate that the international community include that aspect from the earliest stages of a peacekeeping operation. If the international community, led by the United Nations system, acts rapidly, coherently and effectively, it will significantly increase the possibilities of building peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development.

We must always bear in mind the fact that peacebuilding is, first and foremost, a national responsibility that naturally requires the primary participation of national actors to build sustainable and lasting peace. Consequently, peacebuilding must be centred on building up national capacities. Strengthening the authorities so that they exercise their responsibility is the basis on which a society can build coexistence, reconciliation and tolerance and generate a common purpose as a nation.

However, that responsibility is also a shared one, which the international community must actively support, as the Secretary-General pointed out, under a well-established international leadership capable of coordinating a coherent effort within a common strategy that produces tangible and credible results.

The United Nations must offer a rapid and effective response to countries devastated by conflict, which requires the augmentation of the existing national capacities and a robust deployment that can support national efforts in the most diverse tasks. The effort of the international community quite often focuses on the necessary presence of forces whose objective is to end the violence. Costa Rica believes that it is necessary to increase the contingents of international civilian experts available to support the most diverse development needs of national capacities in all phases of the intervention.

Poverty and economic and social differences are a threat to the sustainability of the achievements reached during peacekeeping operations. Fighting those threats means fostering economic growth and fairness. Economic revitalization and early employment generation, in particular for young people and demobilized former combatants, are essential.

Women play a predominant role in those tasks, since, in most cases, they have been the greatest victims of the conflicts and their involvement is key to the revitalization of the economy and the reconciliation and peacebuilding processes. The United Nations must do everything within its scope to protect them and their children during the conflict phases and to encourage their active participation in the peacebuilding and peace consolidation tasks.

The issue of the sustainability of peace being linked to economic growth will not yield the desired success without the consideration of fairness. Public policies and ethical practices that foster equal

opportunities, giving access to basic State services such as education and health, are indispensable for early peace dividends to arise in the process. In addition, development cooperation, which must play a relevant role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, as well as in establishing the foundations for sustainable development, has an important place.

Reducing military spending is one of the most effective ways to boost socio-economic development. Costa Rica is a clear example of that. Redirecting our military spending to sectors with social impact has borne visible dividends for my country, even for the most sceptical, guaranteed the population relatively high levels of human development and increased our contribution to peace and regional stability. If the international community's intervention encourages and stimulates the decision of countries in post-conflict situations to moderate their military spending and to invest increasingly more in health, education and housing and increasingly less in weapons and soldiers, that step will undoubtedly open more opportunities for greater peace dividends.

I wish to conclude by taking advantage of this opportunity to praise the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and of the Support Office of that Commission. We believe the expertise that both those bodies can contribute to be very valuable to the drafting of mandates of the peacekeeping missions that this Council authorizes.

We also thank the Secretary-General for his commitment to this topic and for his report, which, in our view, represents considerable progress in the area of peacebuilding processes and, together with his plan of action, constitutes the beginning of the implementation of initiatives to promote a peace that is seen not only as the lack of conflict but rather as a lasting and sustainable peace based on reconciliation, coexistence and tolerance and centred on the belief in the country's shared purpose to eradicate the causes and the incentives of the conflict.

I wish to express the appreciation and the support of my country for the work on the draft presidential statement that the delegation of Uganda has put forward for the conclusion of this debate.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for making a special trip to New York to preside over today's meeting. We welcome the report of the Secretary-General (S/2009/304) and wish to thank him for his presence and his presentation. Our thanks also go to Ambassador Muñoz and Mr. McKechnie for their respective briefings.

Peacebuilding is a new concept that appeared following the end of the cold war. In 1992, former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in An Agenda for Peace (S/24111), for the first time introduced the concept of peacebuilding. That was another milestone in the collective security system of the United Nations following the establishment of peacekeeping operations. It shows that the international community has realized that the end of a conflict does not necessarily mean the arrival of peace. Post-conflict peacebuilding is highly relevant to durable peace and security in countries that are emerging from conflict.

Over the past decade and before, the United Nations has played a very significant role in post-conflict peacebuilding with notable achievements and has also accumulated rich experience. When the Peacebuilding Commission was established in 2005, that signalled a very important step forward in peacebuilding.

However, the United Nations is also faced with many challenges with regard to peacebuilding. Under certain circumstances, national ownership is not fully recognized, intervention in post-conflict peacebuilding is not timely, financial contributions are inadequate and multilateral and bilateral coordination are insufficient.

China supports the efforts to further strengthen the capacity and leading role of the United Nations in peacebuilding and the coordination and coherence of peacebuilding activities.

I wish to make the following four points. First, respect for national ownership is the cardinal principle of post-conflict peacebuilding. The primary task of peacebuilding is to restore the governance mechanisms of the nations concerned. The nations involved and their political leaders should put national interests above everything else. They should respect and effectively implement peace agreements and resolve their differences through dialogue and consultation, based on a commitment to national reconciliation, democratic reconstruction and economic rehabilitation and development.

When the international community is involved in peacebuilding efforts, it should listen to the views of

the Governments and peoples of the countries involved and fully respect the political, cultural, legal and religious traditions of the affected countries. International assistance strategies should be tailored to the specific needs of the countries affected and should fully consider the priorities established by those countries.

It is not possible for peacebuilding to have a one-size-fits-all standard. A peacebuilding strategy should be tailored to the specific conditions of the affected country. Attention should be paid to enhanced capacity-building and to the training of personnel during the implementation of peacebuilding processes. Priority should be given to existing personnel and expertise of the countries affected.

Secondly, adequate funding is a fundamental guarantee of effective post-conflict peacebuilding. Post-conflict countries are mostly war-torn and in a chaotic state, with inadequate governance and development capacities. Swift and timely support and assistance by the international community are indispensable. The Peacebuilding Fund and other bilateral and multilateral donors have played a very important role and have provided many resources, but they remain unable to meet genuine needs. China supports improving the operation of the Peacebuilding Fund, expediting disbursements and strengthening outcome evaluation and accountability.

The Secretary-General has recommended that, in the light of the special needs of the countries concerned, donors should transform their thinking on assistance in order to create a flexible, rapid assistance model with predictable funding, and that they should consider the establishment of innovative funding channels such as country-specific funds. Those recommendations merit serious consideration.

Thirdly, coordinated activities at different stages of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are necessary to create durable peace for the countries affected. Conflicts in the world today are increasingly complex and diverse. The objectives of peacebuilding require an integrated systematic strategy. Peacebuilding should be taken into account beginning at the stage of peacemaking. Only when the security situation has been stabilized, when a highly representative Government is in place and when national reconciliation is being promoted can the environment for economic reconstruction and rehabilitation exist. Only when economic reconstruction and rehabilitation are possible, can the people share in the peace dividend and the peace process be built on a solid political basis. Justice and the rule of law are the necessary conditions for the stability and development of countries and regions emerging from conflict. But without development, justice and the rule of law will only be castles in the air. Combating impunity must be consistent with the overall need for political dialogue and expedited national reconciliation.

Fourthly, strengthened coordination and coherence among multilateral institutions and donor countries is an important channel to create synergies within the international community on post-conflict peacebuilding. The United Nations should continue to play a leading role in the area of peacebuilding and should establish and coordinate stable and coordinated relations with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other international partners and fully consolidate assistance resources from the various funds. United Nations agencies and entities should have a clear division of responsibility to strengthen cooperation. The Peacebuilding Commission, as the primary body for coordinating United Nations peacebuilding endeavours, should play a greater role in coordinating international peacebuilding efforts.

At present, Africa is not only an important continent for United Nations peacekeeping operations, but also a focus of United Nations peacebuilding efforts. The international community should strengthen its assistance to peacebuilding in Africa in order to help affected countries strengthen their peacebuilding, rehabilitation and reconstruction capacities.

China supports a greater role in peacebuilding efforts for the African Union. We call upon the international community to continue to provide Africa with assistance in order to help its countries emerge from conflict and turbulence and achieve stability and development.

The failure or success of peacebuilding efforts in Africa will be a litmus test for United Nations peacebuilding mechanisms. We hope that the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General and other relevant entities and bodies will work together to steadily scale up United Nations peacebuilding

capacity and make positive contributions to the maintenance of world peace.

Mr. Codman (Turkey): First of all, Mr. President, let me join previous speakers in welcoming Your Excellency and commending the Ugandan presidency for organizing this timely meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding and preparing the draft presidential statement, which we fully support. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his substantive report (S/2009/304) and briefing, which included valuable assessments and recommendations on how to develop United Nations activities pertaining to post-conflict peacebuilding. I wish also to thank the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Assistant Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the representative of the World Bank for their valuable contributions.

I will try not to repeat what has been said around the table regarding the Secretary-General's report. In brief, we support the Secretary-General in his efforts to streamline the response of the United Nations in the immediate aftermath of conflict, and we share his ideas with respect to the way forward. Yet, I would like to emphasize and reiterate some issues which we deem particularly important.

As experience shows, winning peace is often more difficult than winning war. Peace processes in their early stages are often fragile, and relapse into conflict poses an even greater threat. Thus, the risk of failure is very high if peace is not supported from day one. In that respect, the first two years after the end of a conflict are perhaps the most critical period, during which we can either sow the seeds of a lasting peace or set the course towards a dead end, albeit with good intentions.

It is also a fact that tangible results in that period can be achieved only if political, social, humanitarian and economic considerations, as well as security needs, are addressed in a holistic manner. In this context and as was pointed out in the thematic debate held on 29 June under Turkey's presidency of the Council, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are inseparable, integral parts of a whole, and success can come only if we treat them as such.

In the realm of peacebuilding, the United Nations undoubtedly has a significant role to play. There is ample room for improving the United Nations response to post-conflict situations, including, first and foremost, taking the necessary measures to ensure that the entire United Nations system acts in unison towards a single set of objectives and delivers as one. Quick and effective results can be achieved only through such a synergy of efforts. Thus, we welcome and support the Secretary-General's recommendations towards that end.

That said, and notwithstanding its key leadership responsibility, the United Nations is not the only actor that can make a difference on the ground in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. Indeed, given the manifold and multifaceted challenges, effective peacebuilding requires much broader international support. Thus, the coherence and coordination of international endeavours become key to helping countries succeed in their efforts to construct and implement a viable road map to peace. Indeed, echoing the words of the Secretary-General,

> "National authorities, the United Nations system and other international partners can have a much greater and earlier collective impact if we agree on an early strategy with defined and sequenced priorities, and align action and resources behind that strategy" (*S/2009/304, para. 6*).

In other words, the strategy for building peace ought to be devised as early as possible, should cover all aspects of the requirements of the post-conflict situation, has to be based on the common vision of national and international partners alike, and must be well supported by financial resources and technical expertise.

Additionally, priority-setting must reflect the unique conditions and needs of the country, taking into account the lessons learned from past experiences and matching the existing capacities available to the task in hand. The expertise and accumulated experience of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme, in particular, can be extremely helpful in guiding post-conflict recovery and reconstruction. We also believe that the rapidly progressing Peacebuilding Commission could and should play an important role in promoting an integrated approach to peacebuilding. We therefore look forward to the review in 2010 with a view to further enhancing its capacity and effectiveness.

In the light of the foregoing, we agree with the five-point agenda set out by the Secretary-General to facilitate an earlier and more coherent response of the wider international community that reflects all these

core elements. In particular, we strongly support the view that building national capacity and thus ensuring national ownership is an essential priority and that it has to be considered from the outset as the central element of all peacebuilding efforts.

Indeed, we have to seize the rather limited window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict by responding rapidly and effectively in support of the development of national capacities across the entire spectrum, ranging from security to the rule of law, from national reconciliation to electoral processes, and from basic socio-economic services to the return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

Cognizant of the importance of delivering substantial assistance in these key areas, Turkey continues to focus its support in post-conflict societies on these key deliverables. For instance, our policies and programmes in Iraq and Afghanistan, where we continue to undertake rather ambitious reconstruction and development activities, are designed precisely for that purpose. Turkey's provincial reconstruction team in Vardak, Afghanistan, in particular, is a good example of our comprehensive and multifaceted approach, placing national capacity-building at its core.

We also recognize the importance of rapidly deployable civilian capacity to help achieve these key deliverables, and we support the Secretary-General's recommendation that the pool of civilian experts be broadened.

Finally, I would like to touch upon the issue of financing. Better peacebuilding practices require better financing. Thus, we recognize the need for more flexible and predictable funding for post-conflict peacebuilding efforts. In this context, the Peacebuilding Fund is setting a good example. Turkey stands fully behind its commitments to the Fund and makes its contributions to the Fund without caveat. We also agree with the observations of the Secretary-General that the country-level multi-donor trust funds should be used more extensively and that the partnership between the United Nations and the World Bank must be further improved.

Before concluding, I would like to underline once again Turkey's continued commitment to supporting the enhancement of the United Nations peacebuilding efforts in every possible way, as well as our determination to help ensure a well-coordinated international response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, which represents a vital window of opportunity to build and sustain peace. As Ambassador Muñoz said, the time has come to move from words to action, and Turkey is ready to assume its fair share in this endeavour.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over this important meeting. Your brotherly country launched this wise and timely initiative, and we are extremely thankful to you for it. We also thank the Secretary-General for introducing his valuable report (S/2009/304), and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their important contributions.

Over the past two decades, the United Nations has done a great deal to prevent and resolve conflicts and to maintain and build peace. While the Organization has several achievements in this area to its credit, efforts to ensure stability and economic recovery, in particular in the aftermath of a ceasefire or the signing of peace agreements, continue to face great challenges. In-depth study is required to overcome the difficulties and shortcomings and to determine the most expeditious way to end a conflict, restore trust among the various sectors of an affected society, and implement programmes to promote economic recovery and sustainable development.

In his report, the Secretary-General defines the most important and urgent objectives for peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. These include providing basic security, delivering peace dividends, shoring up and building confidence in the political process, and strengthening core national capacity to lead peacebuilding efforts. I do not believe that anyone can have any objection to those goals, but the great challenge is how to respond effectively to those priority goals.

In his report, the Secretary-General proposes a plan for rapid response within the United Nations and other actors in order to meet the following challenges: first, to ensure rapid deployment of more effective and more solidly structured United Nations teams; secondly, to set priorities and ensure that resources are available to implement them; thirdly, to provide United Nations support for national ownership and developing national capacity from the beginning; fourthly, to strengthen and rationalize United Nations capacity to

identify staff, expertise and resources that can be deployed immediately in the post-conflict peacebuilding environment; and fifthly, to work with donors to ensure that financing mechanisms function more speedily and flexibly and are more risk-tolerant and better aligned.

We thank the Secretary-General and other United Nations departments for putting forward these elements. However, we feel that it is clear that each of those elements faces a number of challenges, which will demand greater effectiveness, despite the enormous efforts of the Secretariat and Member States in recent years. I would like to focus on the two most important challenges, which I believe are critical to building and consolidating peace. These two challenges are capacity-building and financing.

We all know that, in the aftermath of a conflict, the institutions of a State have been dismantled. The country lacks capacity and expertise on the ground. The financial system is completely ineffective. The sources of financing are not guaranteed. These conditions make national Governments incapable of carrying out their mission.

There is no doubt, then, that the first priority of peacebuilding is to form a stable political system. This requires building and developing essential capacities of the State so that it can restore its legitimacy and provide basic services to its citizens. This will promote economic recovery and strengthen the labour market. That is why we support the view that building such capacity must be a prime element of any peacebuilding effort from the very onset. We believe that such capacity should be based primarily on available local expertise, and after that on expertise provided by countries that share the same culture, as well as by regional and subregional organizations, whenever possible.

Major international organizations should take full advantage of local capacities in the given country. We should avoid the excessive use of international staff so that employment opportunities in the country in question are not undermined. Two sectors where it is important to strengthen capacity in post-conflict peacebuilding are security and finance.

The first is linked to stability, security and justice, which are key to restoring citizens' trust in their Government and convincing them that peace has its dividends. The second sector is clearly linked to State revenue and to its management. If there is no effective financial or tax system, the State will not be able to meet its obligations or provide basic services to its citizens, and runs the risk of social instability and relapse into conflict.

Reconstruction efforts face a number of obstacles resulting from limited financing channelled through weak and often inadequate mechanisms. It is therefore necessary to find a way to make financing flexible, predictable and rapid, as well as sufficient and timely. We hope that the Partnership Framework Agreement between the United Nations and the World Bank will provide for effective management of multi-donor funding and facilitate the use of that funding.

We also hope that the Peacebuilding Commission will play a greater role in finding innovative ways to secure funding for peacebuilding and to encourage donors to provide speedier, more flexible and more risk-tolerant funding. We believe the Peacebuilding Fund can make a greater contribution to bridging the gaps between pledged funding and available funding.

We welcome the workplan proposed by the Secretary-General with regard to the United Nations response in the early post-conflict phase. We reaffirm the importance of the role to be played by the Secretary-General's representatives on the ground in bringing together all influential actors in the aftermath of a conflict, so that strategies and plans of action can be adopted based on a national approach and tasks prioritized and delimited. Financing must also be provided from the outset.

Mr. Mayr-Harting: Mr. President, we highly appreciate your presiding over this important meeting. We express our thanks to the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for having organized this debate.

Let me also thank the Secretary-General for the important presentation he made to us today. We also welcome Ambassador Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and the representatives of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme for their contributions.

Austria associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union later in this meeting.

Let me say that seizing the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of a conflict is a crucial investment in order to lay the ground for

long-term peace and stability. We concur with the Secretary-General that it is essential for the international community to ensure that a peacebuilding perspective is in place from the very first days after the cessation of a conflict. Peacebuilding efforts must be undertaken and supported from the earliest stage onwards, and as the representative of Japan and others have said, they must go hand in hand with the possible deployment of integrated peacekeeping missions.

In order for peacebuilding measures to prove successful, national ownership must be at the centre of all efforts. All peacebuilding efforts should therefore draw upon existing national capacities, as the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission has already said, while at the same time assisting with capacity deployment. From our point of view, this should also include the identification of opportunities for local private-sector engagement. Let me add that local private-sector engagement can also play a role when it comes to procurement for United Nations peacekeeping.

The protection of civilians and effective programmes for disarmament and demobilization and reintegration must be key priorities in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. There should be a clear focus on the long-term reintegration of former combatants and on the strengthening of the rule of law and institutional reform, including security-sector reform. Short-term peacebuilding measures must be undertaken with a view to long-term peacebuilding. The establishment of, and support for, effective and independent justice and reconciliation mechanisms is crucial. That will contribute to justice, long-term peace and reconciliation in war-torn societies, thereby helping to minimize the risk of future violations.

Austria believes that successful peacebuilding can take place only if all the relevant actors are included. I would therefore also like to express my support for the comment made by the representative of the United States. We need to acknowledge the vital role played by women in re-establishing post-conflict societies. Women have specific insight into the needs of their societies, which is why their involvement in peacebuilding efforts should be enhanced and the provision of gender-specific funds ensured.

Enhanced coordination, not only within the United Nations system but also with other international partners, is a prerequisite for avoiding duplication and ensuring the efficiency of peacebuilding efforts. It is essential to make maximum use of partners with a comparative advantage on the ground. That is of course very often particularly true of regional and subregional organizations. For that very reason, we need to intensify cooperation with them.

Furthermore, Austria supports the Secretary-General's recommendation to strengthen the authority of senior United Nations leadership on the ground as a means of increasing accountability.

Austria also welcomes the crucial role of the Peacebuilding Commission in addressing a country's post-conflict needs. We would like to underline the necessity of involving the Peacebuilding Commission from the outset. By promoting a coherent and integrated approach that highlights the principles of national ownership and regional cooperation, the Commission provides valuable support for long-term democratic consolidation and sustained economic development. It is therefore best placed to develop an international consensus on peacebuilding, which is necessary to bridge the gap between early stabilization and recovery efforts and longer-term development planning. We attach great importance to building further on the Commission's accomplishments and look forward to the refinement of its working methods and tools in the context of the 2010 review.

To underline our commitment to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, Austria recently asked to become a member in its country-specific configuration for Sierra Leone. The Secretary-General has mentioned that Sierra Leone is a showcase for cooperation and synergy among United Nations actors on the ground in the framework of peacebuilding. We are therefore happy that our request has met with the Commission's approval. We will actively contribute to its work.

Finally, I would like to thank the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for preparing the draft presidential statement, as well as to express our full support for it.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I would like to welcome your presence among us today, Mr. President, as well as to thank you for providing us an opportunity once again to express ourselves on the important issue of peacebuilding, which is the subject of the report of the Secretary-General (S/2009/304). Before moving to the issue before us, allow me to welcome the Secretary-General's important statement,

as well as the outstanding statements delivered by our special invitees.

We welcome the conclusions of the report of the Secretary-General, which, let us recall, was explicitly requested by the Security Council at the end of its debate held on 20 May 2008 on this same issue. Everyone agrees that the immediate post-conflict period is a decisive moment in providing every opportunity for the success of the peacebuilding process — given, of course, that there a commitment first on the part of national actors, who have the primary responsibility in that regard, then on the part of the international community.

National ownership is therefore crucial if a peacebuilding process is to be viable. In particular, that entails meaningful political commitment on the part of all members of society, including the most vulnerable and marginalized groups. The national dynamics must nevertheless be accompanied by an effort by the international community to provide support, especially to overcome challenges associated with security, socio-economic recovery and relaunching rule-of-law institutions, which cannot be left solely up to post-conflict countries.

We therefore agree with the Secretary-General in emphasizing the crucial duty of the international community to respond appropriately, quickly and effectively in priority areas such as the security sector, providing basic social services, re-establishing State authority and revitalizing the economy. That should be done while strengthening and supporting available local, national, regional and international capacity on the ground. Above all, after clearly identifying a country's specific priority needs, that entails responding appropriately to the root causes of a conflict in order to prevent the recurrence of hostilities.

Given their knowledge of the situation on the ground, the involvement of regional and subregional actors is also a major factor in the success of the peacebuilding process. The participation of the Economic Community of West African States in the peacebuilding process in Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone and that of the Central African Economic Community in the Central African Republic, as well as the peacebuilding experience in Burundi, which was led successfully by Uganda and South Africa, all attest to the importance of that involvement.

The United Nations is called to play a leading role in that joint effort. We would in particular like to emphasize the need to pursue efforts to improve the coordination and coherence of the Organization's actions in order to clearly identify responsibilities and improve the predictability of international support.

We also support the Secretary-General's recommendation concerning the need to establish a programme aimed at improving United Nations action and facilitating that of other participants by making it more coherent and timely. Ultimately, the goal is to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system to provide expertise and staff who are ready to be deployed quickly to the field to respond to the priority needs of countries emerging from conflict.

Moreover, we would like to commend the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission, which is the best framework for coordinating the efforts of the international community in the area of peacebuilding. We also welcome its efforts to respond to requests from countries emerging from conflict, in particular with regard to mobilizing international financial, material and logistical support. In that regard, we also welcome the commitments made by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

In conclusion, we express the hope that the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General and the positive contributions emanating from various discussions at the Peacebuilding Commission will make it possible to redress the shortfalls in the collective response to post-conflict challenges. We nevertheless trust that the commitment and concerted efforts of the entire United Nations system, along with those of the international community, will help to make the peacebuilding process more viable and effective, so as to ensure lasting peace and development in countries emerging from conflict.

We of course also support the draft presidential statement that has been circulated by the delegation of Uganda.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are pleased to see you, Mr. Minister, presiding over the Security Council. We thank the Secretary-General for preparing and presenting his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), a document richly deserving of the most careful analysis and consideration.

We share the approach to the criteria for peacebuilding activities set out in the report. We agree that it should be based on the principles of national ownership and capacity-building in countries moving towards peacebuilding, together with the development of a peacebuilding strategy as soon as possible after the settlement of a conflict. The task of the United Nations is to coordinate international assistance and ensure coherent synergy and efficiency in the efforts of various international actors.

External assistance to post-conflict countries should be aimed at building their national capacities. The report provides an objective account of the challenges facing peacebuilding activities. Quite rightly, it includes such factors as the ways in which international assistance is fragmented and inadequate, the irrational division of labour among the various participants in the peacebuilding process, and the inadequacies of financial mechanisms.

The drive to enhance the efficiency of United Nations efforts in post-conflict response is hampered by systemic problems that are addressed with great candour in the report. We welcome the fact that the Secretary-General intends to promote initiatives aimed at strengthening the Secretariat's organizational mechanisms and ensuring their coordinated implementation. The report quite rightly states that there should be a single methodology for assessing countries' needs during the post-conflict phase and that national institutions should play the lead role in that regard. We studied with interest the programme developed by the Secretary-General to improve the post-conflict response mechanism, and we consider many of the related proposals to be reasonable and appropriate.

In addition to the establishment of a standby team and rosters of peacebuilding experts, national capacities must be exploited to the utmost and strengthened. We must encourage the creation of rosters and of civilian standby teams by Member States, regional organizations and international financial institutions. The Secretary-General's proposal that such rosters be drawn up at the United Nations level to create capacities for ensuring accountability and reform in our human resources divisions should be submitted for the consideration of Member States, including for an assessment of their financial implications. We support measures aimed at further improving strategic coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank, an important partner of the Organization on peacebuilding issues.

The Peacebuilding Commission plays the primary role within the peacebuilding architecture. It is required to coordinate international peacebuilding activities, mobilize resources and monitor progress in the implementation of national strategies. While we are generally satisfied with the experience accumulated by the Commission in this area thus far, its mechanisms and working methods must be further adapted and developed. Unfortunately, the report does not devote sufficient attention to the Commission per se, although the time is ripe to develop proposals to improve the way in which it functions.

The Commission could be more actively engaged in the processes of peacebuilding and socio-economic transformation currently entrusted to many peacekeeping operations. Given the increasing complexity and multifunctionality of modern peacekeeping mandates, it would be rational to assign United Nations peacekeepers only to initial recovery tasks, and for the capacities of the Commission, regional organizations, international financial institutions and donors to be deployed in the subsequent stages of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Of particular importance is the task of strengthening the organic relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council, particularly on issues on the agendas of both entities. We must also ensure timely exchanges of information between them, as well as a clear division of labour and complementarity. Clearly, this must be done in parallel with the strengthening of the linkages among the Commission, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We support General Assembly resolution 63/282 on the revision of the terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund. It is important to continue to work to increase the Fund's effectiveness and transparency.

We are grateful to the delegation of Uganda for preparing the draft presidential statement on post-conflict peacebuilding, which has our full support.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the convening of this important thematic debate. I should also like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for introducing his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

Since the inception of the Agenda for Peace 17 years ago, post-conflict peacebuilding has evolved into an integral part of the collective efforts of the international community to eliminate the prolonged effects of conflicts and to support a smooth transition to lasting peace and sustainable development.

The immediate post-conflict period is critical to addressing a host of opportunities and the challenges of disarming, demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants, strengthening the rule of law and security sector reform, promoting inclusive dialogue and reconciliation, supporting the return and reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, restoring Government functions and jump-starting economic revitalization.

Over the longer term, substantive investments in poverty reduction, hunger eradication, essential public services, employment creation, social parity, institutional capacity-building and the Millennium Development Goals, inter alia, will serve as linchpins in tackling the root causes of conflicts and laying the foundations for nation-building efforts. If those recurring priorities are addressed in a timely manner, the post-conflict journey towards lasting peace, stability and prosperity can be much smoother.

The fast-moving and uncertain post-conflict environment requires dovetailed support and cooperation from the plethora of multilateral agencies and international stakeholders concerned. In recent years, the United Nations has been working diligently to enhance its efficiency and effectiveness through reform efforts related to the pillars of peace and security, development, human rights, humanitarian affairs and international law.

Standing at the very heart of the international peacebuilding architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund have played a central role as the dedicated institutional mechanisms for focusing attention, mobilizing resources and improving coherence, while addressing critical gaps, needs and priorities in countries emerging from conflict.

Given the fact that many conflicts have cross-border dimensions, regional and subregional organizations have established support frameworks to bring their comparative advantage in terms of knowledge of specific local conditions to bear on the work of peacebuilding. At this time of global resource constraints, international financial institutions have also worked to align funding decisions behind immediate and medium-term peacebuilding and recovery assistance.

Provided with differing mandates, guiding principles, governance structures and financing arrangements, United Nations agencies and other partners involved early in the recovery of countries that have experienced "hot" periods of crisis are challenged by the overriding need to move forward and to ensure clarity on roles and responsibilities, the rational prioritization and division of labour, shared planning and analysis, stronger partnerships and greater accountability. It is imperative that their efforts be coordinated and integrated so that all available resources can be fully utilized. Simultaneously, any unnecessary overlap or competition must be reduced and economies of scale maintained.

In that regard, we welcome and look forward to further concrete results in the implementation of the Secretary-General's agenda on strengthening and supporting leadership teams in the field, promoting earlier strategic coherence, reinforcing national capacity from the outset, improving the ability to provide rapid and predictable capacities, and enhancing the speed, flexibility, amount and risk tolerance of post-conflict financing.

Even with the best intentions, external assistance to promote and strengthen war-to-peace stabilization processes will likely be regarded as an imposition unless the cardinal principles of respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States are strictly followed and unless beneficiary host countries are given ample space to determine policy options and decision-making in the pursuit of their goals and objectives.

As the legitimate masters and the biggest beneficiaries of peacebuilding, local populations must be empowered and involved in every step of this long-term endeavour. The entrance, implementation and exit of international assistance should be tailored to and driven by the specific needs and priorities of the country in question, with the consent of local parties and within the overall framework of maximally drawing on and developing national ownership, self-resilience and self-reliance.

In this regard, Viet Nam registers its steadfast support for the cause of peacebuilding and stands ready to share its related experience of capacity development and international cooperation with all interested stakeholders.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Ebrahim Ismail Ebrahim, Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa.

Mr. Ebrahim (South Africa): South Africa wishes to express its appreciation to the Ugandan presidency for organizing this important debate. We also thank the Secretary-General for his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

This debate follows many robust consultations, which sought to create a common plan and strategy to effectively respond to challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 as an intergovernmental body to advise countries emerging from conflict was a direct response by the international community to address these challenges.

In that regard, South Africa welcomes the fact that the report before the Council was compiled in consultation with the Peacebuilding Commission. While South Africa supports initiatives and programmes that augment the work of the Commission, it is important that the Commission continue to be strengthened and that it remain the focal point of peacebuilding activities, in line with its mandate. Thus, the report of the Secretary-General should be seen as an attempt to strengthen and enhance existing mechanisms within the United Nations and to streamline those outside the Organization in an effort to better respond to the immediate aftermath of conflict.

In his report, the Secretary-General acknowledges that the immediate aftermath of conflict, while challenging, also offers a window of opportunity for the international community to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, shore up confidence in the peace process and strengthen core national capacities. The Secretary-General also proposes an agenda on how the United Nations can be strengthened in order to respond to the immediate aftermath of conflict and identifies the following areas as priorities: basic safety and security, basic welfare, economic reintegration and support to political processes.

South Africa fully concurs with the Secretary-General that national ownership of the peacebuilding process is critical for confidence-building and strengthening fragile Governments. Our experience in African peace processes, such as those in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi and Côte d'Ivoire, has also shown us that a peace agreement alone is not sufficient to bring stability in the country. Effective communication and inclusive dialogue between national actors and the civilian population are critical in building confidence in the process, which allows for realistic expectations by the population.

Accordingly, it is important that national actors be capacitated in order to meet these expectations. Again, South Africa's engagement in the African peace processes has also shown that lack of due attention to national capacity development has the potential to constrain national actors from taking ownership of their recovery process.

In that regard, South Africa would like to stress the important role that women continue to play in peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict societies.

South Africa believes that regional and subregional organizations have always been an important element of the multilateral system. Many with their own capacities are making a direct contribution to peace and security in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the United Nations Charter. For instance, the African Union, with its Peace and Security Architecture, continues to demonstrate the commitment and desire to successfully contribute to the achievement of stability, peace and political solutions in the continent. These organizations also possess a considerable amount of human capacity, which need to be harnessed and utilized effectively in order to augment the capabilities of the United Nations. South Africa's own experience has shown that the use of civilian expertise can be a valuable tool in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

The Secretary-General identifies an agenda for action by the international community on key priority areas, among which is the role of the United Nations. The United Nations possesses enormous comparative advantages, which should be marshalled to provide effective leadership, coordination and accountability,

particularly as relates to its country teams on the ground.

South Africa has always supported the idea of integrated peace missions in view of the interdependence of United Nations efforts in countries emerging from conflict. We believe that this integrated approach will go a long way in maximizing the impact of United Nations responses.

Related to this is the issue of the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment. South Africa is of the view that the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment should be synergized with the Peace-Building Commission. The experience of the past four years has shown that the advisory role of the Commission has been instrumental in assisting the countries on its agenda to develop their national strategy frameworks. South Africa believes that the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment process needs to compliment the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Commission, the Commission had demonstrated the ability to deliver effectively on its mandate, notwithstanding the challenges of the past four years. South Africa looks forward to the forthcoming five-year review of the Commission, to take place in 2010, which will be critical in giving an assessment of the Commission's work and of progress achieved so far.

South Africa is of the view that, in order for post-conflict peacebuilding to succeed, it is imperative that immediate, predictable and flexible financial resources be made available. Therefore, forming solid partnerships with institutions such as the World Bank in a sustained manner is vital.

Lastly, my delegation supports the draft presidential statement to be adopted by the Security Council later today.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Jean Francis Bozizé, Minister Delegate at the Presidency of the Central African Republic in charge of National Defence, Veterans' Affairs, Victims of War, Disarmament and Restructuring of the Army.

Mr. Bozizé (Central African Republic) (*spoke in French*): On taking the floor at this meeting of the Security Council, I would like to start by conveying to the President, to his delegation and to all members of the Council the warmest greetings of the authorities of my country and assurances of their commitment to the implementation of a programme for post-conflict recovery in the Central African Republic.

More than 10 years after the crises in my country, the political and security situation remains an issue of real concern, despite the stability and peace it now enjoys. Today, the authorities face numerous challenges arising from the disruption of the economy, displaced populations and the destruction of infrastructure, which have resulted in impoverishment and suffering.

The restoration of relative calm shortly after the inclusive political dialogue was immediately followed by a wave of violence with the occupation of the eastern prefecture of Vakaga by rebels of the Union de Forces Démocratiques pour le Rassemblement. The reconquest of this region by Government forces was not enough to put a stop to the irredentist dreams of those who were nostalgic for the time of armed uprisings. We thus have seen the re-emergence of armed groups whose real motivation was none other than to satisfy their own thirst for power.

The wounds inflicted by the bloody conflicts on the country remain, for the means of production have collapsed, the social fabric is torn and infrastructures have been destroyed. The fragility of the economy, the precarious state of institutions and political instability make it difficult to implement classic development programmes with any rapidity. At the same time, humanitarian aid is falling off for lack of resources due to the international financial crisis, and the tools at its disposal are not adequate to respond to the country's needs for economic and social recovery.

Thousands of people have been displaced towards more peaceful areas, including outside the country itself. Around 300,000 displaced persons have been counted at several places on the Chadian border, living in a highly precarious situation and lacking drinking water and the barest of necessities.

The Government, after an effort to engage in dialogue with armed groups so as to lessen the population's suffering, has undertaken security sector reform aimed at enhancing the capacity of the defence and security forces within the context of democracy and good governance. The conclusions of this political dialogue provide for an immediate ceasefire, a demobilization of former combatants and their reintegration into civilian life or into the regular army

in order to provide a sustainable solution to the problem of lack of security.

The transition from armed conflict to peace is a complex process that involves making the country secure, protecting the people, reintegrating displaced persons and refugees, rebuilding infrastructure, relaunching the economy, promoting good governance and political dialogue, and restoring the social capital of the country.

Conflicts pose a greater challenge to rehabilitation programmes and make it very difficult to find coherent links between emergency aid, rehabilitation and development, as crises most often follow a pattern of deterioration, escalation, disorder, calm and hope to a reversal of the situation. In spite of the actions of armed persons in the regions I have just mentioned, we look forward to the return of calm.

We need to consolidate what has been achieved through that calm. After the peace agreements with the Government, and although some armed groups may still be reluctant to join the peace process, in a State as fragile as the Central African Republic, the post-conflict rehabilitation programme needs to be launched as soon as possible. It is particularly important to respond both to the urgent humanitarian needs resulting from the conflict and to support a social, political and economic development process that aims at achieving peace and stability. We also need to integrate post-conflict rehabilitation into an overall global strategy.

It is essential that the improved prospects for peace and economic recovery be exploited to encourage all actors to speed up the demobilization of their combatants. The World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme have joined that process, and the initial resources have allowed us to demobilize and reintegrate 7,665 ex-combatants who returned to their communities in 2007.

I would also like to share with the Council a major concern of the Central African Republic authorities. Over the past 10 years, the phenomenon of child soldiers took hold in the Central African Republic, where several hundred children under the age of 18 fought with the armed groups. Children are vulnerable, and perpetual conflict interrupts their education and destroys their future. Rehabilitation in this context consists of restoring their childhood to these young soldiers, porters, messengers, cooks or, in the case of girls, sex slaves. I therefore welcome the fact that post-conflict rehabilitation programmes take the situation of child soldiers and girls into account.

We are confident that several factors may still undermine the post-conflict rehabilitation operations, whose success depends on the relative stability on the ground, a minimum level of security, the soundness of the peace agreements, and the political will of the parties to resolve the conflict. Our willingness to engage in dialogue is clear, however, and we offer as proof of that the many peace agreements signed with various armed groups, the amnesty offered to the leaders, and the holding of the inclusive political dialogue.

The Government insists on an in-depth analysis of the structural causes of the conflict in the Central African Republic, and on the establishment of a general framework for advancing priority sectors and measures. Balanced stabilization measures are required in the political, economic, legal, social, environmental and military spheres in order to harmonize the interdependent objectives of peace and development.

There is obviously the question of the availability of financial resources, which depend in particular on the genuine commitment of the international community to supporting us in the transition from conflict to peace.

I personally am confident that, after this meeting, the foundations will be laid for a post-conflict rehabilitation programme in the Central African Republic. I therefore support the text of the draft presidential statement that has been presented by the delegation of Uganda. I base my hope and optimism on the commitment of the Security Council to contributing to the definitive return and consolidation of peace in my country.

The President: I now call on His Excellency Mr. Mohamed Abdullahi Omaar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia.

Mr. Omaar (Somalia): First of all, I thank you, Sir, for this opportunity to participate in and contribute to the consideration of the way forward for peacemaking and peacebuilding. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) reflects both our experience and our needs. We welcome and support its proposals and recommendations.

Somalia and South Asia are proof that we have no choice but to make peace and to build on it. To take but one example, piracy off the waters of Somalia, based on the absence of a national capacity to enforce the rule of law for 18 years, has impacted and affected the lives of almost every region of the world. Therefore, I believe that disengagement from peacemaking and peacebuilding is not an option at all.

As has been said, peacemaking needs vision and a common strategy. From our perspective and due to our history, the peace that we seek is subregional. For 50 years, the Horn of Africa has been at war in one form or another, and we believe that the wider peacemaking and peacebuilding effort in the Horn of Africa is the only guarantee for the peace that we are working towards in Somalia.

Secondly, our experience shows that peacemaking and peacebuilding are not only parallel and simultaneous, but also incremental. In Somalia, despite the problems, two thirds of the country are peaceful and in the peacebuilding phase. The North and the North-East provide examples of locally grounded initiatives that have developed and grown to that stage.

We are now fully and frankly engaged in the completion of the Djibouti peace process in the remaining third — the southern part — of the country. That can be achieved only by reinforcing both the ongoing political peacemaking process and the security stabilization programme.

Somalis have shown national ownership in the stable parts the North and the North-East and in the Djibouti peace process. We have a three-pronged base for national ownership: the North, the North-East and now the Djibouti peace in the South. That has been achieved at a high cost in human life.

We now believe that the proposals and recommendations of the Secretary-General first, for one, a coordinated and timely response by the United Nations agencies and the international community and, secondly, for the capacity-building of the institutions of the State on the ground are the two most critical factors that need to put in place. In terms of Somalia, those are the two priority areas where we need the international community to complete the cycle and the circle of peacemaking and peacebuilding. That is necessary both for the peacebuilding in the North and the North-East and for the peacemaking in the South, where we are engaged.

On behalf of Somalia and its people, we are ready and we confirm our readiness to work with the Secretary-General, the Council, the Peacebuilding Commission, the World Bank and all United Nations agencies to carry through those two elements — capacity-building, on the one hand, and the coordinated and timely response led by the United Nations agencies, on the other.

The indication and example of the international community's involvement in Somalia, alongside our own peacebuilding and peacemaking efforts, are represented by the initiatives of the Security Council, the Peace and Security Council of the African Union, the African Union Mission in Somalia, and the forces of Uganda and Burundi. Both Burundi and Uganda have gone through the same experiences as us, and I believe that they are the proof that the consistency of the international community can help people on the ground deliver the peacemaking and the peacebuilding that we are discussing here today.

Despite the fact that 18 years have passed in Somalia, the achievements in the North and the North-East speak for themselves and for Somalia. The process is now under way in the southern part of the country, and we believe that we can complete that process and close the current chapter of the history of Somalia.

The President: There are a number of speakers remaining on my list for this meeting. I intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3.15 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.25 p.m.